

Date: Fri, 15 Apr 94 04:30:07 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #172
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 15 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 172

Today's Topics:

ARRL report on preferred calls (2 msgs)
ARRL rpt on preferred calls
LICENSING DELAYS (3 msgs)
Waiting for a license.

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 14 Apr 1994 15:31:02 GMT
From: olivea!sgigate.sgi.com!sgiblab!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!wang!dbushong@ames.arpa
Subject: ARRL report on preferred calls
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mtracy@arrl.org (Michael Tracy) writes:

>Posted April 11, 1994

>This file contains the Final Report of the ARRL Ad-Hoc Committee
>on Preferred Callsigns

>Committee Members:

>Mr. Steve Mendelsohn, WA2DHF, Chairman

>Mr. Frank Butler, W4RH

>Mr. Tom Comstock, N5TC

 ^ ^ ^^^

Hmmm....

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.

Date: 14 Apr 1994 18:53:59 GMT
From: galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
news.kei.com!yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
news1.oakland.edu!vela.@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL report on preferred calls
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Don't grin too wide, Dave.

Your not the only person who noticed these guys *probably* have very
little interest in vanity calls as they already have some doozies!

73 paul wb8zjl

Date: 13 Apr 1994 23:56:05 GMT
From: ncar!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!vela.acs.oakland.edu!
prvalko@ames.arpa
Subject: ARRL rpt on preferred calls
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

: From the original posting:

: >Committee Members:
: >Mr. Steve Mendelsohn, WA2DHF, Chairman
: >Mr. Frank Butler, W4RH
: >Mr. Tom Comstock, N5TC
: >Mr. John Kanode, N4MM
: >Mr. Brad Wyatt, K6WR

: Not too many 1's and 0's on the committee! Funny how people always jump
: to attribute the worst possible motives to the ARRL.

As I said earlier, not too many "undesirable" calls in that group
either. By the way, we Life Members get to rag on Newington all we
want, it's in the by-laws, somewhere.

73! Paul wb8zjl

Date: 14 Apr 94 12:25:20 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: LICENSING DELAYS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>I am waitting 60 days for a back order on the 610 formes themselves.
>So I guess if you can't get the forms, you can't clog up the system!!!!
>Bill Cornutt WB6YWI

if you have a high quality duplex copier and paper of the appropriate color,
copies will do just fine. It's got to be a close match on color and the copy
process has to be free of distortion and the copies have to be "clean"....

Date: 13 Apr 94 16:19:19 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!blackhole.delmarva.com!
blackhole.delmarva.com!news@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: LICENSING DELAYS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 766178900@rose-hulman.edu, supervisor@rose-hulman.edu (EE DEPT NOVELL
SUPERVISOR) writes:

> Im just getting into this medium, and this is the first day I have
> checked into this "net", so mabe this has all been hashed out and the FCC
> will begin May first with getting licenses back to our new hams in two
> weeks. But 12 weeks is absolutely assinine. I understand that there are
> 4 people in Gettysberg working on 610 apps. No they probably cant handle
> the influx of requests.
> #1 Lets cut the beaucroatic excuses and get this mess cleaned up.
> #2 Lets get our public servants organized so that they can do their
> jobs effeciantly for the nation.
>
> Where is our ARRL ???? What are our ARRL lawyers in washington doing?
> Again we dont want to hear all the reasons and excuses! lets get something
> done! NOW!
>
> I once had a commanding officer in the navy tell his junior officers;
> Don't bring me problems, damn it, bring me solutions!
>
> Solution # 1
> ARRL go to washimngton to the FCC and TELL them that the league will
> cordinate the volenteers from the amateur fraternity to come to Getttsyberg
> and provide the labor to get them up to date. No excuses accepted.
> If they will not accept our help, then the league should sue the FCC in court
> to accept the help and start a national public awareness campaine to expose
> this mess.

>
> Solution # 2
> Offer, at no cost to the government, to study the processing
> procedures and come up with a list of solutions to make them more
> effeciant.
>
>
> No I'm not waiting myself for a license. I've held mine for
> 34 years. But I do have a group of Boy Scouts who have worked since last
> Oct. to pass their exams in Feb. and are still waiting like I'm sure
> hundreds, thousands of others are for their first ticket. I think MY
> league should be doing something, NOW!
>
> Dave Gahimer
> K9ZCE

Amen to that! I am not a happy camper about the delays. I would be most willing to take a week off and give the FCC a hand, gratis. If it's systems help they need, I am sure the ham community can handle that.

The good news (?) is that I'll probably be done my General elements by the time my no-code Tech gets here.

- John

```

---
+-----+
| John K. Scoggin, Jr.      Email: scoggin@delmarva.com  |
| Supervisor, Network Operations      scoggin@ee.udel.edu  |
| Delmarva Power & Light Company      Phone: (302) 451-5200  |
| 500 N. Wakefield Drive      NOC: (800) 388-7076  |
| Newark, DE 19714-6066      Fax: (302) 451-5321  |
|                               Ham: N3??? (real soon now!) |
| The opinions expressed are not those of Delmarva Power, simply the |
| product of an over-active imagination...  |
| Time is Nature's way of preventing everything from happening at  |
| once.  |
+-----+

```

```

-----
Date: 14 Apr 1994 01:45:19 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!
bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!jlw3@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: LICENSING DELAYS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

Jonathan Sherman (jsherman@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:

: My fiancée called the FCC and was told 14-16 weeks for her license????

: She took her test the first week of February!

I'm no longer surprised. I'm on week 16 myself. I took my test in December!!!

Date: 14 Apr 1994 00:17 CDT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!rosie.uh.edu!st3qi@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Waiting for a license.

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

To give you something to reference, I gave an exam session on Jan. 22, 1994 and the examinees are finally getting their licenses this week. One person received KC5FYQ.

-Brad Killebrew N5LJV

-st3qi@jetson.uh.edu

-President, Univ of Houston ARC

Date: 13 Apr 94 17:28:16 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!

newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!vela.acs.oakland.edu!

prvalko@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Apr11.185455.12361@arrl.org>, <2ofgpt\$at7@oak.oakland.edu>,
<Co780H.GxD@world.std.com>.edu

Subject : Re: ARRL rpt on preferred calls

David R Tucker (drt@world.std.com) wrote:

: Huh? Did you look at the calls of the members of the committee? Or
: their current addresses? None has a 1 or 0 call, or lives in 1 or 0
: land.

<grinning here> Yeah, Dave, I did look at their calls. Except for the
chair of the group, every one of those fellas had a rather short (i.e.
desireable) call. I really doubt any of them will be interested in
changing those calls, but who knows? I certainly think that a more
OBJECTIVE group of individuals could have been picked, perhaps someone
with a call that REALLY stinks... like WB8ZJL ?? :-)

: Sorry, I'm going to agree with them on this one. I don't think the
: FCC should *make* you change your callsign when you're in a new

```
: district, but if that's where you are and you want a new call, you
: should get one that reflects your location, IMO.  If that means not
: everyone can have K1SS, that's OK with me.  (The biggest equity
: problem with this that I see is uneven population growth in the
: various districts.)
```

That is not much of a problem. On one of the repeaters I frequently use, there are two guys who got P.O. boxes in 3-land when the 2x1 calls here in 8-land were exhausted, and got 2x1 3 calls. It's inconvenient, but obviously not a big deal. I'll certainly do so if it comes down to it.

: A more substantial objection (read "the one I care about more") is
: that it looks, the way it's written, as though any club or repeater
: group with a single Extra member is going to be able to get a Group A
: callsign at the same time as any Extra-class individual. If so, these
: are **really** going to be gone in a flash, and since clubs are somewhat
: less mortal than people, the calls they snap up will be off the market
: more or less permanently.

```
: I don't really know how to fix this, since contesting clubs certainly
: should have shorter calls. But surely not every repeater club or
: general purpose club needs one? Most clubs should probably get 2x3s,
: but I have no idea how to implement this objectively. Perhaps clubs
: should have last preference (or "gate"), individuals should have first
: crack at vacated calls, and perhaps preferred calls should be
: restricted to clubs that have been in existence for more than x years.
```

Right on. I'll (with luck) get TWO vanity calls! One for home, and one for the club I'll form with three other hams. Hmmmmm have to get my wife, and two kids tickets... hoooooooooooooooooooooo :-)

73 =paul= wb8zj1

Date: 14 Apr 94 01:37:29 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!
haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!murdoch!
faraday.clas.Virginia.EDU!clh6w@uchvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2ofgpt\$at7@oak.oakland.edu>, <Co780H.GxD@world.std.com>,
<2oha3g\$c0s@oak.oakland.edu>
Subject : Re: ARRL rpt on preferred calls

I have not seen in either the FCC proposal on vanity callsigns or the ARRL's response any proposal to handle the order

of applications. We are all smart enough to know what
callsigns are not assigned, and of those, which ones are
particularly attractive. So what happens when 100 of us
submit vanity callsign applications with some of the
same callsigns on them?

Suppose my first choice is W4AA and my second choice is W4BB.
But another ham's first choice is W4BB and his second choice
is W4AA. That's fine so far--no problem. But then
along comes another application with first choice W4BB.
Who wins?? Will it be first come first served?
Alphabetical order of existing callsign? Flip a coin
computer style?

Has anyone seen any mention of solutions to this problem?

Date: Thu, 14 Apr 1994 18:17:21 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
news.umbc.edu!eff!news.kei.com!world!dts@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2ofgpt\$at7@oak.oakland.edu>, <Co7pFy.2wp@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>,
<2oi0ql\$6ds@oak.oakland.edu>s.umb
Subject : Re: ARRL rpt on preferred calls

In article <2oi0ql\$6ds@oak.oakland.edu> prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu (prvalko)
writes:

>
>: From the original posting:
>
>: >Committee Members:
>: >Mr. Steve Mendelsohn, WA2DHF, Chairman
>: >Mr. Frank Butler, W4RH
>: >Mr. Tom Comstock, N5TC
>: >Mr. John Kanode, N4MM
>: >Mr. Brad Wyatt, K6WR
>
>: Not too many 1's and 0's on the committee! Funny how people always jump
>: to attribute the worst possible motives to the ARRL.
>
>As I said earlier, not too many "undesirable" calls in that group
>either. By the way, we Life Members get to rag on Newington all we
>want, it's in the by-laws, somewhere.
>
>73! Paul wb8zjl
>

>

The committee had the input of MANY surevey responses. The survey was posted to packet, and was printed in many club newsletters. The information in these surveys were the basis for the recommendations.

Warren WB1HBB was actively involved in all of this. I doubt he'd change his call no matter what. I don't plan on changing mine!

I don't see a 1 or 0 as any more or less desirable than any other digit. (well, perhaps 5 is really good 'cause its the fastest on CW ;-).

Dan

--

Daniel Senie Internet: dts@world.std.com
Daniel Senie Consulting n1jeb@world.std.com
508-779-0439 Compuserve: 74176,1347

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #172
